U.S.
HQ1421

THE

NATIONAL LEAGUE

FOR THE

PROTECTION

OF THE

FAMILY

Annual Report for 1907

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

THE
National League for the Protection of the Family.

President.

Hon. SETH LOW, LL.D., New York.

Vice-Presidents.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D., LL.D., Boston.

Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., Cambridge.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Treasurer.

WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, Care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston.

Executive Committee.

Pres. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph.D., LL.D., Newton Center.

Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.

Prof. ALBION W. SMALL, Ph.D., LL.D., Chicago.

Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D.D., Worcester.

EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston.

FRANK GAYLORD COOK, Esq., Cambridge.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

REPORT

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

Year Ending December 31, 1907

BOSTON:
THE EVERETT PRESS COMPANY, PRINTERS
74 India Street
1908

Notes.

1. Our Reports for the years 1890, 1892, 1897, and 1901–07 are the only ones that can now be supplied. The Report for 1905 is a "Review of Twenty-Five Years," giving a summary of the movement regarding the family and our work for that period, and will be freely sent to all who ask for it.

2. The paper of the Corresponding Secretary read before the Congress of Arts and Science in St. Louis on the "Problem of the Family," and a report of 20 pp. of a committee with Prof. A. R. Merriam chairman, made to the National Council of Congregational Churches in October, has been reprinted from the minutes of the council and will also be sent to those who desire it.

3. The Report of the Census Office on Marriage and Divorce in the United States for the last twenty years, and practically for a period of forty years, is now expected to be ready in the summer. If our funds warrant we shall issue as soon as possible a summary of its more important results.

4. For this and the ordinary work of the League an increase of contributions this year will be absolutely necessary. And these extra gifts should come early in the year. See the Treasurer's Report, on page 15.

Every friend of the family and home is urgently invited to give the League a place by the side of other benevolent societies in his annual charities, in recognition of the fact that money applied to the protection and development of the home is also in aid of all institutions and interests dependent on good homes. The League needs an immediate endowment. Attention is called to the form of bequest on the third page of the cover.

5. Associate Annual Membership is offered to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of five dollars for the year, to be renewed at the pleasure of the subscriber. Such persons are for the time members in full, entitled to all the privileges of the League, including its publications and the right to vote in all its meetings.

6. The Treasurer, Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, care of C. F. Hovey, and Co., Boston, Mass., will acknowledge all contributions. All other correspondence should be addressed to Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass. Contributions may also be sent to him.

Minutes.

The annual meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family was held at the Diocesan House, No. 1 Joy Street, Boston, on Friday, January 24, 1908, at 2.30 P.M. The meeting was called to order by Rev. S. W. Dike, the Corresponding Secretary. The Vice-President, the Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, then took the chair, and George P. Dike was chosen Recording Secretary *pro tempore*. After prayer by Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., the minutes of the last meeting were read and approved. Dr. Dike then read letters from absent members.

Rev. Samuel C. Bushnell was then elected to membership.

The following officers were elected for the ensuing year:

President, Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York.

Vice-Presidents, Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston; Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge.

Corresponding Secretary, Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale.

Executive Committee, Pres. William E. Huntington, LL.D., Newton Center; Pres. George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst; Prof. Albion W. Small, LL.D., Chicago; Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Boston; Mr. Everett O. Fisk, Boston; Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., Cambridge; Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale.

The annual report of the treasurer, Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, was read and approved and referred to Mr. Cook as Auditor. Dr. Dike read extracts from his annual report as Corresponding Secretary. It was voted to accept the report, the same to be printed and distributed under the direction of the Corresponding Secretary.

Voted to adjourn.

GEORGE P. DIKE,
Recording Secretary pro tempore.

Boston, Mass., Jan. 24, 1908.

Report of Corresponding Secretary.

Testimony to Wide Interest.

Professor A. W. Merriam, of the Hartford Theological Seminary, whose knowledge of the movement regarding the family is equalled by very few students, has recently said in a report on problems of the family:

"Few social issues are coming to be so emphatic just now. Drama and novel and newspaper treat these questions in flippant or serious mood. Fifteen leading religious denominations have recently organized, in essential harmony, regarding divorce. . . . Local ministerial bodies, in various States, are indicating the minima of their action in questionable marriages. The American Bar Association has lately suggested amendments in law. In the last two years two sessions of a great Interstate Congress, representing forty States and Territories, and composed of delegates eminent in various callings, have offered to legislatures a bill for restriction of causes for divorce to six, strictly guarded, and for uniformity of procedure, eliminating the more flagrant abuses; and have publicly proclaimed that such legislation is only the best at present attainable, and have appealed to the churches to enlighten public opinion. The Supreme Court has given a recent decision on migratory marriages which will have wide-ranging, conservative action. New census data by act of Congress, fast nearing completion, will be published soon. President Roosevelt has set an example of unequivocal language regarding the duties of the family. New societies in New York and Pennsylvania, composed of eminent physicians and laymen, are preparing for vigorous discussion of sex-diseases and sex-morals.

"Your committee would, therefore, emphasize a note of hope and courage, for

"1. Church interest and action can no longer be regarded as isolated and provincial. Great ranges of literature, science, and legislature are equally aroused, and sociological studies have given us a better perspective.

"2. The widest and most variant literature shows that, however strict or lax our theories may be, they all alike confront four stubborn facts: first, the natural and universal dominance of sex; second, some fundamental view upon the marriage bond as primary; third, the de-

pendence of these views upon the religious, or, at least, ethical and social evaluation we place upon the home; and fourth, the necessity of guarding the individual in his rights and duties as the finest fruit of the ages, and yet of training Liberty and Relationship to live and work together. There is no mediatorship between the two comparable with that of the home. We can safely have no throne in the State only as there is one in the family.

"3. The trend of all organic social investigation leads inevitably toward the home as the most vital factor. But the family has relinquished less its individualistic note than have the other great organic institutions of government and education; for at this very citadel of all social readjustment we still find that individualistic theories of the marriage bond, laxity of sexual freedom, and a double standard of virtue are widely prevalent; and we let mere happiness, personal predilection, and controllable aversion dominate the continuance of the marriage relation with little regard to the broader interests of society. But there are two elements of hope: first, that the family problem can not much longer ignore the organic standards of moral obligation felt in other spheres; and, second, that the home is more directly under the control of a right church influence than is any other social group."

This extract points both to the wide interest that is now taken in the subject of the work of the League and to the complex character of the work to be done. The family probably affords the most intricate of all social problems, and must therefore tax the thought of the best minds so long as human society exists. For there is no such thing as a final solution of a social problem until society ceases to be the thing it is — a living, growing organism.

While our reports of the movement and of the work done must necessarily vary greatly from year to year on a subject that does not keep exact pace with the seasons, it will not be difficult to see the steady trend of a strong movement, with here and there marked advances in it. The legislation, for example, in a single year seemes comparatively insignificant. But when we make a summary of it for ten or twenty years, as we shall soon have it from official sources, the movement in the right direction appears to have surprising volume and strength. We have this year no startling things to report, but a steady progress of interest in the general subject. This is shown more especially in the continuance and kind of inquiries that come to us through correspondence. A steady though not always a large flow of letters of inquiry come to us for information of all sorts, especially from young students and their instructors in our higher educational institutions. And this happens though our annual reports go into the libraries of large numbers of these.

The Call for Information.

It is interesting to see the wide range of the field on which parties seek for information. Aside from the numbers of divorces granted, their statutory causes, the length of married life, their increase or decrease, and similar matters that lie on the surface, we are asked about the influence of sex, of property, of the rights of married women, of the influence of divorce on poverty, crime, suicide, insanity, children, and the birth-rate; of divorce, desertion of families, and the vices of sex on the moral and physical condition of our people. Many people who reflect on the subject are much impressed with the enormous tax that the evils that affect our domestic life have on the intellectual, moral, and material welfare of the country, and long to see some attempt at something like a scientific measurement of them. So far, the best experts do not see the way clear to much farther effort in the direction of governmental investigation than the Report on Marriage and Divorce has now gone. We have thought of the use for more special inquiry of some of the generous funds now provided for private scientific investigation for the public good, but as yet the way has not opened to secure it. Possibly it will in the future. So far these special funds have been more devoted to material and biological welfare than to the social and moral. There are intimations later in this report of the possibility of a denominational publishing society taking up a part of this work — the diffusion of knowledge already at hand — that is within its particular field. But philanthropists need to remember that the social cell, as the home may properly be called, is as worthy of extended study as the biological cell or the atom in the realm of mechanics.

The Marriage and Divorce Report.

We had expected to be able to present in this report a summary of the results of the coming Report of the United States Census Office on Marriage and Divorce in this and other countries for the last twenty years, bringing the report for the earlier twenty years down to date. But an unexpected lack of funds for this particular object compelled the Census Office to suspend all work on it for several months. The work has now been resumed, and it is hoped that the report may be ready for the public by midsummer.

The former report was regarded by many competent judges here and in Europe as one of the most useful and important reports ever issued from Washington. As its three large editions are now entirely out of print, the coming report will incorporate in its pages summaries of the matter of that earlier report, and will thus be a summary of the movement of marriage and divorce laws and of marriage and divorce

statistics, so far as these are available, for all countries over a period of forty years. Some most important things will be brought to light. Among these are the enormous amount of divorce in this country, and the location of its greatest prevalence. If we may judge by some reports that apparently came from the Census Office, there were more than a million divorces in this country in the last twenty years, or three times the number in the preceding twenty. We shall learn whether migration for divorce, which ought to be decreasing, is really growing less. The report ought to show the effect the restrictive legislation of the last twenty years has had on reducing or retarding the increase of divorces. It will throw light on the effect of such measures as the various forms of restriction on remarriage, the appearance of a representative of the State for the protection of its interests, the lengthening of the term of residence in a State before one can enter a suit for divorce, and other matters of practical importance. And not the least of its exhibitions will be the light it will indirectly throw on the limitations of law in correcting the evils of divorce, the greater need of public education in the nature and place of the family in the social order, and the great duty of the Church and our educational institutions to do fundamental work in its interests.

It is our purpose to prepare at the earliest possible date a pamphlet summary of the essential points brought out in the government report for distribution among those who are or should be interested in this most fundamental of all social questions. It is earnestly desired that those who read this part of our own report will recognize the fact that for this purpose we shall need a considerable increase in our funds, and send us their contributions immediately, so that we may know what we can depend upon.

The Uniform Divorce Bill.

This bill, prepared a year ago, has been enacted entire in New Jersey and Delaware. Some account of its provisions was given in our last report. It came before the Legislatures of several other States, but failed to pass in one or both houses. Legislators were under the impression that the bill must be enacted entire or wholly rejected, which was not the intention of the Congress that framed it. While it is desirable that the bill be enacted entire, its friends will be glad to have the States put into their statutes as many of its features as practicable, rather than have them take no action.

The chief difficulty in the way of enactment seems to have been the provision of the Uniform Law for Divorce from Bed and Board, Divorce *a mensa et thoro*, or Judicial Separation, which are three different terms for the same thing. Some States strongly object to the res-

toration or the introduction of this form of separation. The subject was warmly discussed in the last meeting of the State Commissions on Uniform Legislation in Portland, Me., in August, of which many of the members of the Divorce Congress that prepared the proposed Uniform Divorce Law were also members. But after the fullest discussion, in which the liberty of each State to reject parts of the bill was pointed out, the entire bill received the formal and hearty endorsement of the Commissions on Uniform Legislation. As the form of divorce is left in the bill optional with the courts, and as it affords the relief of a temporary or permanent separation to those who from religious or other motives do not wish for an absolute divorce, this conclusion seems entirely proper. As a matter of fact, very few separations without absolute divorce are granted in those States where the law now permits them.

In Massachusetts, and perhaps other States, the members of the Divorce Congress have not urged any change in the legislation at present, because the law of the State is already substantially that of the proposed Uniform Act. In some the law is already more strict than the Uniform Bill would make it, and there of course there is no call for a change. As these reports have frequently pointed out, the evils from our conflicting divorce laws, serious as they are, fall far short of being the graver part of the divorce evil. And apparently the divorces due to migration from one State to another are steadily decreasing in number, as we shall very likely see when the coming government report gives us the facts for the last twenty years. Good judges think that the results of the first year of experience with the Uniform Bill are as great as can be reasonably expected, and that in time the bill will be pretty generally enacted. In this slow beginning the Divorce Bill is only following the experience of other measures for uniformity, which start slowly but in a few years succeed in a large number of the States.

Other Legislation of the Year.

California this year requires that race distinctions be noted in marriage licenses, and that consent of parents to a marriage must be given in writing.

Idaho requires the registration of marriages.

Indiana prohibits hereafter the marriage of first cousins, and has made it a misdemeanor for divorced persons to marry within a year.

Kansas now gives by statute full faith and credit to divorces granted in other States.

Maine modifies its law regulating the qualifications of ministers who may celebrate marriage in the interests of greater strictness, now requiring a certificate of ministerial standing from ecclesiastical bodies

to the Secretary of State, who is henceforth to take the place of the Governor in issuing licenses to ministers who may celebrate marriages.

Massachusetts has taken an important step in protecting the interests of the State in divorce suits. This is proving useful. The courts may now appoint an attorney to investigate and report the facts in relation to divorce suits. The courts may also direct such attorney to defend the suit. The appointment may be before or after the decree *nisi* has been rendered. This attorney may also enter objections to making the decree *nisi* absolute. This State makes further regulations regarding the marriage of minors.

New Hampshire also regulates still farther the marriage of minors.

New York has enacted the past year a pretty elaborate marriage law with careful details defining the persons who may celebrate marriage, providing for license and record of marriages, protecting against false statements, and making other provisions such as were apparently necessary after the substantial abandonment by that State of its old permission of common-law marriages—so called. New York has thus come from its peculiarly lax condition regarding marriage into the rank of those States that most carefully protect the institution.

North Carolina, which has lately reduced its legal grounds of divorce to one, has now so far modified its law that absolute divorce may be granted in the case of parties who have lived apart ten years and have no children.

North Dakota defines those who may celebrate marriages and further regulates the granting of marriage licenses.

Oregon forbids district and prosecuting attorneys receiving fees in divorce cases.

South Dakota now requires the plaintiff in divorce cases to reside one year in the State in good faith before bringing a suit, unless the offence for which the divorce is sought was committed within the State. Then six months is a sufficient time of residence. Hereafter hearings and trials must take place at the regular sessions of the courts.

Wisconsin two years ago passed a law, which we failed to report at the time, forbidding the marriage of divorced persons for one year.

Our Marriage Laws.

It will be seen from these notes on the legislation of the year that the States are giving more attention to the improvement of their marriage laws. We have often had occasion to say that the marriage laws of the country need attention quite as much as the divorce laws.

In some States there has grown up a serious evil from the practice of parties going to another State than their own to be married, either more hastily or more secretly, or for some other trivial reason. For some

years Rhode Island has been a Gretna Green for many of the people of Massachusetts. No less than 523 couples who were residents of Massachusetts took out marriage licenses in the city of Providence alone in the year 1906. And the practice is by no means confined to that city. This evil has been restricted somewhat of late by the refusal of the authorities of that city to grant licenses out of regular office hours or on holidays, and the leading men of the city are proposing to secure some effective legislation to check it altogether, if possible. The adoption of the law of some States requiring all marriage licenses to be taken out five days before the marriage, or to have this done in all cases of non-residents seeking marriage in the State, would probably eliminate most of these undesirable cases.

The evils arising from our American lax way of allowing people to get married in any town, city, or state where they choose are very serious. As our report some years ago showed, the German way of having people married in the place where they live, except in carefully guarded instances of peculiar cases, and having the record of the dissolution of all marriages, whether by death or divorce, made on the margin of the original record of the marriage, with date, place, and cause of the dissolution, not only makes bigamies practically impossible, but protects the marriage relation in other ways. Until such legislation is practicable in this country all who are concerned for the public welfare should do everything in their power to discourage migration from State to State or from town to town to be married. The practice on the part of clergymen of marrying strangers without careful inquiry into the circumstances of the marriage is reprehensible. Careful inquiry into the facts before celebrating the marriage is now regarded by many as the indispensable duty of officiating clergymen. The clergy and others also have the important duty of creating a sentiment among all classes of people that every self-respecting woman will insist, whenever it is practicable, on being married by her own minister in her own church or in her own home. While legal provisions may do a great deal, nothing will really do so much to correct the evils of migratory marriages as the creation of this wholesome public sentiment.

The Church on the Family.

One at least of the national assemblies of the Christian Churches had the past year an elaborate report on the Church and the Family. This was the National Council of Congregational Churches, which went over, as best it could in a report of twenty pages, the relation of the family to industrial, educational, ecclesiastical, and political problems, besides taking up some of the problems of sex. In conclusion the report made the following points regarding the relation of the home

to church and school: (1) the fundamental need is a ministry trained to an understanding of the respective places and duties of the home, the church, and the school; (2) the home should be considered in all plans for church work; (3) the home should be held responsible for the work that naturally belongs to it; (4) the undeveloped or partially developed home needs to be made aware of its duties and opportunities, and it is a great mistake to let alone the home and turn its work over to church and school without attempting to arouse the home to its own responsibilities; (5) the probable early reconstruction of many Congregational and other churches to reduce their multiplicity of societies and other agencies for doing church work to order, and for the sake of higher efficiency, will force upon us the necessity of giving attention to the finding of the true place of the home in the work of the church; (6) the suggestion was made that the churches need a literature covering these and other subjects related to the home for general use, and that the denominational publishing society should consider the suggestion that it enter this field.

It is hoped that this report, of which the League has secured an edition for distribution among its own members and correspondents, will prove of practical value to many churches and ministers. The earlier part of it deals quite fully with the church and divorce. There may be a great work done in its direction by those who are willing to give it time and studious effort. The Congregational Sunday School and Publishing Society will probably give careful attention to the suggestion that it take up the work of issuing a series of papers in some form, either by itself or in coöperation with other similar societies.

A Field of Rich Promise.

It may be doubted whether there is anywhere in the whole range of religious training a more promising field for the earnest and intelligent worker than that afforded by the problem of finding and securing the true place of the home in religious life and work. It is a most difficult problem to solve, but that should not prevent giving it the attention it needs. The Religious Education Association might here find a task worthy of its effort. Its treatment of the problem so far has been altogether too meagre. And the same may be said of the place of the home in connection with the work of our public schools.

The Inter-Church Committee.

This Committee on Marriage and Divorce, representing fourteen of the leading Protestant Churches of the country, has in the last three years met several times and made some recommendations to their various churches, but we are unable to say how far the recommendations

have been adopted by the national bodies represented. The National Council of Congregational Churches adopted them in a modified form. Owing to the sudden illness of the chairman of the Inter-Church Committee at the time, the last session accomplished very little.

The Catholic Church has lately taken steps to enforce more strictly its canons regarding marriage.

Social Diseases and the Home.

Our last report made reference to some movements regarding the prevalence and subtle evils of sexual diseases, and to a movement on the part of highly reputable and wise authorities to deal with the problem. The societies organized two years ago in New York and Philadelphia under the lead of physicians of high standing, and eminent citizens have extended their work the past year, and several similar societies have been organized in other of our largest cities. The society in Chicago is especially vigorous. A special committee reported on the subject to the Massachusetts Diocesan Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church last May, pointing out the serious extent and gravity of the vices of sex and urging preventive action. The same committee is charged this year with the duty of reporting more specifically on the recommendations they have made. The General Association of the Congregational Churches of Massachusetts has appointed a similar committee. While many excellent people have from time to time made efforts in some of the directions of this work, it is now a matter of congratulation that a movement in the hands of people of the very best qualifications for a wise handling of it has entered upon it in this hopeful way. Those who wish to know more of the leading society at work in this field should write to Dr. E. L. Keyes, Secretary, 109 East 34th Street, New York, and consult Dr. Prince A. Morrow's "Social Diseases and Marriages."

Death of the One Who Suggested Our League.

The Rev. George A. Jackson, who had consented to become again our Recording Secretary, died May 8, 1907. He was the first to suggest the organization of the separate committees that had been at work for a year or two in two or three New England States into the New England Divorce Reform League, out of which our present organization grew, and took an active part in its formation. He was for several of its earliest years the Recording Secretary of the League and a generous contributor to its support. At our last annual meeting he was again elected to his old office. Mr. Jackson was a scholar, publishing much in church history, a man of culture and refined tastes and of singularly courteous manners. For some years he had been the Secretary of the

General Theological Library in Boston, still living in Swampscott, where he had been a pastor for many years.

Financial.

In the year before the one for which we now report the San Francisco fire and the special efforts of some of the missionary societies made collections for the League difficult, but we closed the year with only a deficit of $42.95. For the earlier part of 1907 our receipts were considerably in advance of those of the corresponding period of the year before, and we had strong hope of being able to meet all the expenses of the year, besides paying for the extra printing that the appearance of the Marriage and Divorce Report would call for. But in the last few months of the year, and especially after the financial troubles of the country came, our receipts fell off so much that we are now left with a deficit of $182.07. Besides meeting this and the ordinary expenses of the year, we shall need considerable money to print and put into the hands of those who seek it some such digest of the coming Marriage and Divorce Report as that which we prepared of its preceding report twenty years ago, and which was eagerly sought by many who wanted the substance of the government report in a brief form.

We now ask those who read our reports and appreciate the work that we are doing to send us what they can, and as early in the year as possible, that we may know what to expect, as well as meet obligations already incurred.

The report of the Treasurer for the year will be found on succeeding page.

Respectfully submitted,

Samuel W. Dike,
Corresponding Secretary.

Treasurer's Report.

RECEIPTS		$2,030 50
EXPENDITURES		
Rent	$50 00	
Postage	47 15	
Traveling	118 20	
Stationery	5 65	
Telephone	9 68	
Express, etc.	2 15	
Typewriter repairs	2 40	
Printing	127 39	
Envelopes	7 00	
		369 62
		$1,660 88
Salary of S. W. Dike	$1,800 00	
Deficit for year ending Dec. 31, 1907		$139 12
Deficit for year ending Dec. 31, 1906		42 95
Amount of debt Jan. 1, 1908		$182 07

WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, *Treasurer.*

Jan. 25, 1908.

I have this day examined the foregoing accounts of the Treasurer, since Jan. 25, 1907, with the vouchers for the same, and find them correct.

(Signed) FRANK GAYLORD COOK, *Auditor.*

CONTRIBUTIONS.

Jan.	3.	Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	$50 00
	14.	Mrs. William E. Dodge, New York, N. Y.	100 00
	15.	"A Vermont Lady"	100 00
	21.	President W. E. Huntington, LL.D., Newton Center	5 00
	22.	State Street Congregational Church, Portland, Me.	10 00
	23.	E. H. Ellison, Newton	5 00
	23.	George Ripley, Andover	10 00
	23.	Mrs. George Westinghouse, Lenox	100 00
	23.	Frank Gaylord Cook, Cambridge	2 00
	26.	"A New York Friend"	10 00

	28.	Arba N. Lincoln, Fall River	$5 00
	31.	Dr. Lucien Howe, Buffalo, N. Y.	5 00
		Received in January	$402 00
Feb.	2.	Rev. W. Spooner Smith, Worcester	$5 00
	5.	Hon. O. Vincent Coffin, Middletown, Conn.	5 00
	9.	Appleton P. Williams, West Upton	2 50
	13.	James C. Braman, Auburndale	10 00
	13.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I.	10 00
	13.	Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y.	10 00
	13.	Rev. John Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover	10 00
	14.	Hon. James Schouler, LL.D., Boston	5 00
	19.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	5 00
	19.	Hon. Moses Giddings, Bangor, Me.	5 00
	20.	President Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington, D. C.	10 00
	20.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00
	20.	Rev. Arthur Lawrence, D.D., Stockbridge, Mass.	25 00
	22.	Rt. Rev. John Scarborough, D.D., LL.D., Trenton, N.J.	10 00
	22.	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C.	5 00
	25.	Rev. C. F. Dole, Jamaica Plain	5 00
	25.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00
	26.	Mrs. Charlotte F. Blackman, Waterbury, Conn	10 00
	26.	Professor E. Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover, Mass.	5 00
	26.	Rev. William P. Alcott, Boxford, Mass.	2 00
	26.	Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D, LL.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00
	26.	Rt. Rev. William Crosswell Doane, D.D., LL.D., Albany, N. Y.	5 00
	27.	Professor Henry W. Farnam, R.P.D., New Haven, Conn.	25 00
	27.	Hon. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me.	5 00
	28.	Mrs. John S. Mitchell, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00
	28.	St. Agnes Chapel, Trinity Parish, New York, N. Y.	10 00
		Received in February	$269 50
Mar.	2.	Miss Helen E. Chase, Waterbury, Conn	$25 00
	2.	Rt. Rev. Chauncey Brewster, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	3 00
	4.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	10 00
	5.	Morris K. Jesup, New York, N. Y.	10 00
	7.	C. E. Clift, Boston	5 00
	9.	Rt. Rev. Alexander H. Vinton, D.D., Springfield	5 00
	14.	Old South Church, Boston	25 00
	14.	Rev. Joshua Coit, Winchester	2 00
	22.	Mrs. William G. Benedict, Boston	10 00
	23.	Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00
	23.	Rev. George B. Johnson, Burlington, Vt.	5 00
	26.	Hon. W. O. Hart, New Orleans, La.	5 00
	28.	Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H.	1 00

	28.	First Church, Hartford, Conn.	$10 00	
	29.	Christ Church, Hartford, Conn.	10 00	
		Received in March		$131 00
Apr.	3.	Professor Walter F. Willcox, Ph.D., Ithaca, N. Y.	$5 00	
	3.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham	5 00	
	10.	Grace Church, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	17.	George Burnham, Sr., Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	19.	Robert C. Ogden, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
		Received in April		$85 00
May	3.	Rt. Rev. W. H. Hare, D.D., Sioux Falls, S. D.	$5 00	
	11.	Stuart Wood, Philadelphia, Penn.	15 00	
	27.	Hon. James Tillinghast, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	27.	Rathbone Gardiner, Providence, R. I.	5 00	
		Received in May		$35 00
June	3.	Professor L. O. Brastow, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	$5 00	
	4.	Charles Morris Smith, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	6.	Rev. Walker Gwynne, Summit, N. J.	2 00	
	7.	Rt. Rev. W. N. McVickar, D.D., Providence, R. I.	5 00	
	18.	Mrs. John S. Porter, Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
	19.	Women's Missionary Society, St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.	10 00	
	21.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, LL.D., Boston	10 00	
	26.	Rev. Francis Goodwin, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	20 00	
	29.	George Ripley, Andover	10 00	
		Received in June		$97 00
July	2.	Samuel V. Hoffman, New York, N. Y.	$25 00	
	3.	Mrs. Charles P. Turner, Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	4.	"Connecticut"	6 00	
	27.	Mrs. Richard H. Dana, Cambridge	5 00	
	31.	St. John's Parish, Stamford, Conn.	25 00	
		Received in July		$86 00
Aug.	4.	Rev. Cornelius H. Patton, D.D., Boston	$5 00	
		Received in August		$5 00
Sept.	11.	Dr. William C. Rives, Washington, D. C.	$5 00	
	24.	W. J. Breed, Cincinnati, O.	5 00	
		Received in September		$10 00
Oct.	7.	Miss Lucy W. Burr, Auburndale	$25 00	
	8.	Rev. J. H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00	
	9.	Asylum Hill Congregational Church, Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
	10.	Rev. John G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury. Conn.	10 00	

	10.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn.	$50 00
	14.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester	10 00
	21.	Ginn & Co, Boston	10 00
	22.	Hon. J. P. Bates, Brookline	10 00
	23.	Hon. Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale	20 00
	31.	Hon. Frederick J. Kingsbury, LL.D., Waterbury, Conn.	25 00
		Received in October	$195 00
Nov.	11.	Rt. Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D.D., Philadelphia, Penn.	$15 00
	13.	Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00
	13.	Prof. C. R. Henderson, D.D., Chicago, Ill.	2 00
	15.	St. Stephen's Church, Pittsfield	10 00
	16.	Gen. W. A. Aiken, Norwich, Conn.	5 00
	18.	E. P. Dutton, New York	5 00
	21.	Rev. S. C. Bushnell, Arlington	5 00
	23.	St. John's Church, Providence, R. I.	20 00
	23.	W. P. Henszey, Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00
	25.	Grace Church, Providence, R. I.	20 00
	26.	St. Stephen's Church, Providence, R. I.	10 00
	27.	George Burnham, Jr., Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00
	27.	Rev. Horace Dutton, Auburndale	5 00
	27.	Mrs. John S. Brigham, Worcester	5 00
	29.	Arthur C. Farley, Auburndale	5 00
		Received in November	$162 00
Dec.	2.	Hon. Francis Lynde Stetson, LL.D., New York	$30 00
	4.	Hon. John E. Parsons, New York	25 00
	4.	Wolcott H. Johnson, Boston	25 00
	4.	"A Friend," Brookline	20 00
	5.	Rev. James W. Bixler, D.D., New London, Conn.	10 00
	5.	W. W. Lockwood, New York	5 00
	6.	Arthur S. Johnson, Boston	10 00
	7.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	50 00
	7.	Hon. Robert Treat Paine, Boston	5 00
	7.	Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D., Newton Center	5 00
	9.	W. B. Herrick, Auburndale	10 00
	10.	Rev. A. W. Hazen, D.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00
	12.	James C. Borden, Fall River	5 00
	14.	Professor Williston Walker, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	5 00
	15.	Trinity Church, Boston	15 00
	16.	President William North Rice, LL.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00
	16.	Miss M. R. Hicks, Fall River	2 00
	17.	Robert H. Gardiner, Boston	5 00
	18.	Miss Edith Woolsey, New Haven, Conn.	5 00
	18.	E. O. Fisk, Boston	5 00
	19.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston	5 00

20.	E. R. Brown, Dover, N. H.	$5 00	
20.	Miss M. J. Allen, Boston	5 00	
21.	Rt. Rev. Frederick Burgess, D.D., Garden City, L. I.	5 00	
24.	Arthur Reed Kimball, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
25.	Church of the Ascension, New York	25 00	
28.	Miss Grace H. Dodge, New York	100 00	
28.	Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D., LL.D., New York	15 00	
30.	R. S. Douglas, Brookline	5 00	
31.	President William J. Tucker, D.D., LL.D., Hanover, N. H.	10 00	
31.	Rev. Samuel W. Dike, Auburndale	25 00	
31.	President Henry Hopkins, D.D., LL.D., Williamstown	5 00	
31.	Home Department, Union Church S. S., Worcester	5 00	
31.	George S. Alden, Worcester	5 00	
31.	Hon. James Logan, Worcester	10 00	
31.	Rev. W. H. Van Allen, S.T.D., Boston	3 00	
31.	William H. Swift, Pittsfield	25 00	
31.	President W. H. P. Faunce, D.D., LL.D., Providence, R. I.	10 00	
31.	Rev. Andrew W. Archibald, D.D., Newton Center	3 00	
31.	Mrs. David P. Kimball, Boston	25 00	
31.	President George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst	5 00	
31.	Professor Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge	5 00	
	Received in December		$553 00

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

ARTICLE I. This association shall be called the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

ART. II. Its object shall be, through the improvement of public sentiment and legislation, to protect the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce, and to secure its proper efficiency in individual and social life. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number.

ART. IV. The officers of this society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices, to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the third Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two thirds of the members present.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, Mr. WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY, a corporation created by the Laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successor or assigns, the sum of.....dollars, the principal [or income, as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.